

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

1. Interview

The applicant appreciates the courtesy of the examiner in granting an interview with the applicants' representative on November 29, 2005. In accordance with the discussion at the interview, the applicant has amended the claims and presents commentary discussing the distinguishing characteristics of the pending application in view of the cited prior art.

2. In the claims

As discussed during the interview, claim 1 is amended to make it abundantly clear that the method for searching information on the internet is conducted over the Internet, and search robots or engines are used which enable search assistants to select information and reformulate requests. The dialogue between the user and the search assistants is therefore conducted over the Internet, and the information obtained by the search assistants is likewise obtained from the resources available on the Internet.

In addition, claim 1 is amended to clarify the hierarchy of search assistants and their roles, namely the user first transmits over the Internet an information request to a head search assistant who makes an information request. The head search assistant then performs an initial search and provides information for the user to select. The head search assistant then directs the information selection to an adjunct search assistant who is specialized in the area of the subject matter of the information selection in order to refine the searching for information over the Internet.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in the specification on page 12, lines 13-27. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

3. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,393,423 (Goedken) in view of U.S. patent 6,377,944 (Busey) and U.S. patent 5,594,791 (Szlam)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of amended claim 1 which describes that the method of searching for information over the Internet is conducted over a web browser and search requests are channeled through to an Internet Service Provider. In addition, the hierarchy of searching for information over the Internet by using head search assistants and adjunct search assistants is also further clarified in amended claim 1.

As indicated in the reply to the last Office action, the method according to amended claim 1 advantageously directly connects a person searching for information on the Internet with a human search assistant. This is in contradistinction with systems wherein the person is connected to an automated searching system, such as GOOGLE or YAHOO. Instead, the human search assistant is able to work with the person making the request to formulate an effective search inquiry.

Concerning the Goedken patent (U.S. 6,393,423), this patent is not related to the method required in amended claim 1. Instead, the Goedken patent relates to an "Internet" community wherein a request is sent to one of a plurality of information custodians after the information custodian has been selected by a first database (col. 5, lines 31-51). There is no connection between a requestor and a searcher in order to formulate a request in the Goedken patent. Instead, the search request is automatically routed to an information custodian, regardless as to whether the search request was proper or not.

A more detailed discussion as to the differences of previously presented claim 1 and the Goedken patent is provided in Applicant's response dated March 14, 2005.

According to the outstanding action, the Goedken patent fails to teach the limitation required by claim 1 wherein a dialogue is conducted between a user and a human search assistant, as such the Busey patent is provided for filling in the gap in the teachings of the Goedken patent. Moreover, the Szlam patent is provided for overcoming the shortcoming of the Goedken patent wherein a head search assistant directs a call to an adjunct search assistant.

The applicant submits that the Szlam patent does not disclose or suggest the specific step of a head search assistant conducting a dialogue with a user and then subsequently directing the user to an adjunct search assistant on the basis of a first information request and selection. According to the Szlam patent, the system administrator does not receive any phone call from a user, and instead directs the agents to make phone calls themselves. Of note, amended claim 1 requires that the connection between the search assistants be conducted over the Internet, and more specifically over a web browser which is in contradistinction to the teachings of the Szlam patent.

In view of these observations, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered in view of amended claim 1, and the discussion of the pending application and the cited prior art during the interview. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,393,423 (Goedken) in view of U.S. patent 6,377,944 (Busey) and U.S. patent 5,594,791 (Szlam) and further in view of U.S. patent 6,366,906 (Hoffman)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis of the changes made in amended claim 1 from which claim 4 depends. The Hoffman patent

fails to make up for the shortcomings of the Goedken, Busey and Szlam patents in connection with claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

5. Rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,393,423 (Goedken) in view of U.S. patent 6,377,944 (Busey) and U.S. patent 5,594,791 (Szlam) and further in view of U.S. patent 6,405,175 (Ng)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis of the changes made to amended claim 1 from which claims 14 and 15 depend. The Ng patent fails to make up for the shortcomings of the Goedken, Busey and Szlam patents in connection to claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

6. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,393,423 (Goedken) in view of U.S. patent 6,377,944 (Busey) and U.S. patent 6,493,695 (Pickering)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested for similar reasons described in section (3). The Pickering patent suffers similar drawbacks of the Szlam patent wherein the Pickering patent does not disclose or suggest conduct a dialogue via a web browser over the Internet. Withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

7. Rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,393,423 (Goedken) in view of U.S. patent 6,377,944 (Busey) and U.S. patent 6,493,695 (Pickering) and further in view of U.S. patent 6,366,906 (Hoffman)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis of the changes made in amended claim 1 from which claim 4 depends. The Hoffman patent fails to make up for the shortcomings of the Goedken, Busey and Pickering patents in connection with claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

8. Rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,393,423 (Goedken) in view of U.S. patent 6,377,944 (Busey) and U.S. patent 6,493,695 (Pickering) and further in view of U.S. patent 6,405,175 (Ng)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis of the changes made to amended claim 1 from which claims 14 and 15 depend. The Ng patent fails to make up for the shortcomings of the Goedken, Busey and Pickering patents in connection to claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

9. Conclusion


In view of amended claim 1 and the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that claims 1-4, 6-8, 10 and 12-15 be allowed, and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: December 2, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205